

### **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 1, 2007. Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claim Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 20 are being amended, and new claims 21-23 are being added. Thus, claims 1-23 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Support for such amendments and new claims are provided in the application as originally filed, thus no new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **I. Double Patenting**

Claims 1-20 in the instant application were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 1-6 and 8-10 of co-pending commonly assigned U.S. Patent Application No. 10/366,236. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with this rejection, Applicants are timely filing a Terminal Disclaimer to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Please note that a Power of Attorney by Assignee Under 37 CFR §§3.71 and 3.73(b) was filed in this application on December 4, 2003 (mailroom date December 8, 2003), and is miscategorized in PAIR as Oath or Declaration filed.

#### **II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis for "the message context". Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject manner. While Applicants do not necessarily agree with this rejection, Applicants have followed the Examiner's recommendation for amending the preambles of these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090, hereinafter referred to as Amirisetty).

**V. Brief Summary of Amirisetty**

Amirisetty appears to be related to a system and method that enables high level calls (consisting of a sequence of low level calls) to be made to an Enterprise Information System (EIS) loosely-coupled to a container (i.e., external to the container) via a connector from a client loosely coupled to the container (i.e., external to the container) via a service such as a web service (see Amirisetty, column 3, lines 51-56). More specifically, Amirisetty provides a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) framework that allows a connector writer to connect to a system using a low-level API. Using the framework, a user can mine the metadata for functions and generate a description of the high-level function which can then be dropped into the framework and appear as a high-level function, invocable through the connector, to the developer. This high-level function manifestation, when invoked, will drive the low-level API provided by the connector. (see Amirisetty, column 3 line 60 – column 4, lines 5). Stated another way, Amirisetty provides a system and method “of using a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) framework in a container (e.g. application server) to map high-level functions generated by an application to a series of low-level functions for which an interface is provided through a connector to a system (e.g. EIS) external to the container” (see column 5, lines 13-19).

(Please turn to next page)

## **VI. Discussion of Claims**

Exemplary **claim 1**, as amended, is reproduced below, for the convenience of the Examiner.

1. A storage medium including software system applications for providing access to web services, comprising:

a container driver that accepts an invoke request for a web service from a client;

an interceptor that

receives initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of components each of which includes corresponding content, and

modifies the content of one or more of the components of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of components as the initial message context but with the content of one or more components differing from the initial message context; and,

an invocation handler that receives the modified message context from said container driver, passes parameters from the modified message context to the target of the request, processes values returned from the target, and passes the values to the container driver, such that the container driver can formulate a response to the invoke request.

Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the claimed interceptor “modifies the content of one or more of the components of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of components as the initial message context but with the content of one or more components differing from the initial message context”.

Accordingly, both the initial message context and the modified message context are both for the same “web service”. Further, as is now clear, the components of the original message context and the modified message context do not differ, i.e., only the content of one or more such components differ.

As explained in paragraph [0027] of the specification, and now recited in new claim 21 (which depends from claim 1), message context can include a plurality of components, such as a request message component, a response message component, a transport information component and invocation context component, with a difference between the message context and the modified message context being content (e.g., values) of one or more of said components. In other words, the claimed interceptor is not changing the type of message context. This can be appreciated from Figure 2 of the present application, which shows “Msg Context” going from the container driver to an interceptor, and “Msg Context” going back from the interceptor to the container driver. In other words, the type of message context does not change, only the content of one or more component of the message context changes. For example, as explained in paragraph [0033], an interceptor can operate on message headers, i.e., changing the content of the headers, without changing the fact that a header exists and without changing the format of the header.

In contrast, in Amirisetty, the metadata-aware adapter 102 is essentially intercepting high level calls received from a client, and mapping or transforming the high level calls into a sequence of low level calls that the Enterprise Information System (EIS) is able to understand, and respond to. The low level calls will clearly include different components, i.e., they will not include the “same plurality of components” as is required by claim 1. Stated another way, the metadata-aware adaptor 102 of Amirisetty appears to change the type of message context, not simply the content of one or more component of the message context.

The Office Action cited column 6, lines 8-18 for allegedly teaching that the system of Amirisetty can “modify metadata content”, and thus can allegedly can modify message context. However, the cited portion of Amirisetty actually says that an application developer (i.e., a person, not the system of Amirisetty) can modify metadata contents so that the application developer “may switch to a different connector ... typically without modification of application code”. As explained in some more detail at column 6, lines 19-33 of Amirisetty “If an application developer wishes to switch from one connector to a different connector to the external system, the one or more high-level function call definitions that map high-level function calls to the external system to series of low-level function calls to the connector may

be modified to instead map the high-level function calls to the external system to series of low-level function calls to the different connector.” In other words, the so called “framework” of Amirisetty enables the modification of mapping of high level calls to low level calls. This is quite different than modifying message context, such that components of the message context remain unchanged, but content of one or more such components differ.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 2-10** depend from and add additional features to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-10 are patentable for at least the reasons that they depend from claim 1.

New **claims 21-23** also depend from and add additional features to claim 1. More specifically, claims 21-23 provide some additional details about components of message context, and how content of such components can be modified. Applicants assert that Amirisetty clearly does not teach the features of claims 21-23.

Independent **claim 11**, as amended, includes that steps of:

“receiving an initial message context for an invoke request for a web service, the initial message context including a plurality of components each of which includes corresponding content; and

modifying the content of one or more of the components of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of components as the initial message context but with the content of one or more components differing from the initial message context”.

Applicants assert that these steps of claim 11 are not disclosed in Amirisetty for similar reasons to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection of claim 11, and its dependent claims 12-20, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent **claim 21**, as amended, is directed to computer readable medium, including instructions stored thereon which when executed by the computer cause the computer to perform certain steps, including:

“receiving, at an interceptor, initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from the container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of components each of which includes corresponding content;” and

“modifying, at the interceptor, the content of one or more of the components of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of components as the initial message context but with the content of one or more components differing from the initial message context”.

Applicants assert that these features of claim 21 are not disclosed in Amirisetty for similar reasons to those discussed above with regards to claim 1.

(Please turn to next page)

**VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 31, 2007

By: /Jeffrey R. Kurin/

Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Reg. No. 41,132

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800